

**REMARKS**

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-22, 30, 38, 41, 42 were previously cancelled.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 23-29, 31-37, 39 and 40 (16 claims) are now pending in this application.

**Claim rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

On page 3, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-29, 31-37, 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Emery et al (USPN: 5,758,281). The Examiner believes that independent claims 23 and 32 are anticipated by Emery. In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Emery. As best understood, Emery makes it possible for a subscriber (mobile) to change his location without losing his services. However, Emery discloses and teaches that the subscriber in the Emery system remains bound to his own network. In other words, the home location register (HLR) remains the same. (See Emery col. 19, ll. 36-51 and col. 26, ll. 57-60).

In contrast, the present application describes a system that makes it possible for a subscriber to change his home network by changing the local exchange his subscriber line is connected to without losing services. As disclosed and claimed in the present application, a local exchange does not remain the same when the subscriber changes the home network. A method in which the subscriber station is disconnected from the first local exchange in connecting the subscriber station to the second local exchange, wherein the subscriber station is accessible virtually all of the time as required by independent claims 23 and 32, as amended, is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Emery, et al.

Emery makes it possible for a mobile subscriber to change its location without losing its services, for example, accessibility. In contrast, as described and claimed in the present application, a subscriber can change its home network, (i.e., to change the static binding to its home network by changing the local exchange the subscriber line is connected to) without losing services. The Applicant submits that the problem to be solved by Emery is different from the problem to be solved by the present application.

By way of further explanation, the Applicant submits that the first question to be answered is: What network element realizes the static binding (not a dynamic binding) of the subscriber to a network? In case of a fixed network, it is the local exchange of the subscriber. In the case of a mobile network it is the home location register (HLR) of the subscriber.

The second question that should be answered is: Where does a network route an arriving call request for a subscriber first? In the case of a fixed network, it is the local exchange of the subscriber. In the case of a mobile network, it is the HLR of the subscriber. As a result, the local exchange for the fixed network can be compared appropriately with the HLR of a mobile network and not with the visitor location register (VLR).

Accordingly, Emery presents the static binding of subscriber to his home network (HLR) remains unchanged (i.e., the HLR of the subscriber remains the same) when the subscriber changes his location. In contrast, in the present application the static binding of the subscriber to his home network (i.e., the local exchange of the subscriber) does not remain the same when the subscriber changes the (home) network. Therefore, Emery does not anticipate that which is disclosed and claimed in the present application.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of independent claim 23, as amended, and dependent claims 24-31, and 40 which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 23, and allowance of independent claim 32, as amended, and dependent claims 33-39 which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 32.

The Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10-13-06

By



James A. Wilke  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 34,279

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5776  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900